REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gotfried (US2004/0213540).

Applicant submits that Gotfried discloses a method for displaying advertisements that includes the steps of: (a) providing at least one non-transparent cable (114) for transmitting light in which an end of each non-transparent cable is received by a receiving structure (116) and (b) transmitting light selected from a plurality of colors along the non-transparent cables such that the light emitted from the ends of the non-transparent cables received by the receiving structures. The emitted light forms a display in accordance with at least one of a pre-programmed design, and the display is an advertisement or a simulated floor covering. The non-transparent cable can be a fiber optic cable. (See Abstract). More particularly, referring to Fig. 8, in the circuitry for the LEDs, Gotfried discloses a resistor R3 which can limit the amount of current flowing through the LED 125 to protect the LED from damage and a transistor Q1 for adjusting intensity based on input data. See paragraph [0038]. Gotfried does not seem to mention a diode, other than the LEDs themselves, at any point in the specification.

This is in contrast to the current specification. As described at line 14 of page 3 – line 4 of page 4, in an embodiment of the present invention, a diode is provided and connected to a light emitting element, among the plurality of light emitting elements contained in a light-emitting element unit, which requires relatively low voltage for light emission. The voltage drop caused by the diode and the light emitting element together is larger than that caused by the light emitting element alone. The degree of such voltage drop becomes closer to the degree of voltage drop in the other light emitting elements, so that a value of current flowing through is also closer to the value of current flowing to the other light emitting elements. Thus, if a plurality of light-emitting units are connected to a relatively long cable, a difference in the voltage drop and current amount

therebetween per emission color is reduced. As a result, the color tones or hues of emission colors in the plurality of light-emitting units is more uniform. In claim 1, it is clear that the diode provided to adjust voltage drop is different from the light emitting element, which may be an LED. Such an additional diode is not disclosed or suggested in Gotfried.

Therefore, at least one of the features in Claim 1 is not disclosed in Gotfried, inter alia, "wherein the light-emitting unit contains a plurality of light-emitting elements having different emission colors, respectively and wherein a diode is connected to a light emitting element, among the plurality of light emitting elements, which requires relatively low voltage for light emission". As such, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

A similar argument applies to independent Claim 9. As described in the current specification at line 21 of page 4 to line 1 of page 5, the voltage drop for each emission color is held more constant by providing a current regulation diode with a light emitting element. By employing the current regulation diode, the voltage drop and the current value can be set more accurately, thus enabling the color tone of emission color for each light-emitting unit to be more uniform. Such a current regulation diode is not disclosed or suggested in Gotfried.

As such, at least one of the features of Claim 9 one of the features is not disclosed on Gotfried, inter alia, "wherein the light-emitting unit contains a plurality of light emitting elements having different emission colors, respectively, and wherein a current regulation diode is connected to at least one of the plurality of light emitting elements so that voltage drop for each of the plurality of light emitting elements is equal to one another." Thus, Applicant submits that Claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-8 are dependent claims of Claim 1 and Claim 10 is dependent claim of Claim 9. Thus, based on the arguments above and the additional limitations therein, claims 2-8 and 10 are also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Claims 1-10 are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Favourable action on this application is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any further concerns regarding the language of the claims or the applicability of the cited references, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/29/2005

Ralph A. Dowell
Registration No. 26868
Dowell & Dowell, P.C.
2111 Eisenhower Ave. Suite 406
Alexandria, VA 22314
U.S.A.

Tel: 703-415-2555
Fax: 703-415-2559

14362-12/NH